

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

SCOTT CRESPO, Plaintiff, v. KEVIN SAUL, Defendant.	No. 10-CV-05378 Judge: Hon. George M. Marovich
SCOTT CRESPO, Plaintiff, v. BRANDON ZAUCHA, et al, Defendant.	No. 10-CV-05536
SCOTT CRESPO, Plaintiff, v. ANDY SETH, et al., Defendant.	No. 10-CV-06543

AGREED MOTION FOR A TWO-WEEK EXTENSION OF TIME

Plaintiff, by and through his attorneys Mark T. Lavery and Christopher V. Langone, move this Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) for a two-week extension of time to file Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss.

1. Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss is due by 3/11/2011 and Defendants' reply due is due by 3/25/2011.

2. Due to several other professional obligations, including the filing of a Petition for Leave to Appeal to the Illinois Supreme Court, and a preparation of a Petition for a Supervisory Order in *Miller v. Royal Macabees*, 97 CH 4324 due March 8th, 2011, plaintiff's counsel anticipate they will not be able to complete the response by March 11th. Accordingly, they request an extension of two weeks to complete and file the response.

3. While Plaintiff's counsel have been diligently working on the response, the fact-intensive nature of the issues raised by Defendants, the novelty of Defendants' choice-of-law argument, and the complexity of Defendants' dormant commerce clause argument, all necessitate additional time for legal research and writing of the brief.

4. Plaintiff's counsel has not requested any prior extensions. This is the Plaintiff's first request for an extension and Plaintiff does not anticipate any additional extension request will be required absent unforeseen circumstances such as illness.

5. Defendants will not be prejudiced by, and do not object to, the requested two-week extension of the briefing schedule – Plaintiff thus requests that the briefing schedule on the motion to dismiss be extended such that Plaintiff may respond to the motion to dismiss on or before March 25th and the Defendants reply by April 8, 2011.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter granting a two-week extension as set forth in this motion: response due March 25, 2011 and replies by April 8, 2011.

Dated: March 1, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s Christopher V. Langone